LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY
ORGANIZED 1891
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

FIFTH CENTURY B. C. CONCEPTS OF THE PELASGIANS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

AND THE COMMITTEE ON THE GRADUATE DIVISION

OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Virginia Lynne Snyder Abel

August 1966

Approved for the Department:

Antony E. Raubitschek

Approved for the University Committee on the Graduate Division:

Virgil K. Whitaker

Dean of the Graduate Division

PREFACE

The scattered information concerning the Pelasgians preserved for us by ancient authors has fostered continual discussion in modern times. Who were the Pelasgians? Were they Indo-Europeans or identical with the Etruscans? Where was their original home? How did they come to inhabit such far-flung areas of the Mediterranean world as our tradition reports they did? The task of this paper is not to determine any actual facts concerning the Pelasgians. It is not an attempt to answer the above questions. The task is rather an historiographical one: an investigation of the views preserved from the fifth century B.C., especially from Herodotus, as well as an investigation of the bases for these views. In other words, the purpose of this paper is to find, if possible, the essential unity of the Herodotean account and to consider if there is general agreement between it and the rest of fifth century tradition. For only when one clearly understands what the Greeks themselves thought about the Pelasgians, is it possible to consider whether or not the Greeks were correct in their opinions.

The author wishes to express her gratitude to Professor Antony E. Raubitschek for his invaluable assistance. He suggested the problem this thesis investigates and guided the

paper's development. The author is also indebted to her husband, John F. Abel, who read the manuscript and made extensive corrections.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE.		iii
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter I.	THE PELASGIANS AS GREEKS	7
II.	THE PELASGIAN LANGUAGE	19
III.	THE TRANSMISSION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS BY THE PELASGIANS	27
IV.	THE PELASGIANS IN ATTICA	34
V.	THE PELASGIANS IN THE PELOPONNESUS	45
VI.	CONCLUSIONS.	49
TESTIMONIA.		54
BIBLIOGRAPHY.		69

INTRODUCTION

The following discussion of secondary sources presents a representative cross-section of modern Pelasgian scholarship. Particular authors, e.g. Meyer, Myres, and Lochner-Hüttenbach, are emphasized also because their books were especially helpful in the preparation of this paper. The following review is not intended to be a comprehensive bibliography, but rather an essay comparing different approaches to the Pelasgian problem.

Eduard Meyer in Forschungen zur alten Geschichte I, 1892, pp. 3-124, investigates the development of the fifth century B.C. views about the Pelasgians. From the stories current in the fifth century, Meyer attempts to discover the actual historical identity of the Pelasgians by isolating genuine folk tradition from the later inferences and inventions of classical authors. He considers the clusters of stories about Pelasgians in Attica, Thessaly, Dodona, Crete, Arcadia, and Argos and concludes that the Pelasgians were a Greek people who originally inhabited Thessaly, Homer's Pelasgian Argos. They were probably related to other northwest Greeks, perhaps to the mountain people of Epirus; some may even have migrated to Crete. After the Pelasgians were conquered by the Thessalians, they were remembered as the oldest inhabitants of the area. These, in brief, are the

facts determined by Meyer. All other stories, those concerning the Pelasgians in Attica for example, he decides are the result of a long process of literary invention. As an historian, Meyer then dismisses these stories from his conclusions about who the Pelasgians actually were. He does not concern himself further with fifth century attitudes.

Fritz Schachemeyr, under the entry "Pelasgoi" in Pauly-Wissowa's Real-enzyklopädie, briefly reviews the ancient tradition and emphasizes the primeval character of the Pelasgians. He mentions some of the confusions in the ancient tradition, especially about the Pelasgians in Attica, but he does not attempt to explain the sources of the confusions. Schachemeyr states that the historical facts concerning the Pelasgians can be recognized only to a limited degree. However, he generally agrees with Eduard Meyer's conclusions, though he also reckons with the possibility of real Pelasgians having inhabited northwest Asia Minor and Attica as well as Thessaly.

Sir John L. Myres ("A History of the Pelasgian Theory," JHS XXVII, 1907, pp. 170-225) sets out to examine critically the ancient references about the Pelasgians. He arranges the references chronologically and comments upon each passage by using only information that would have been available when the passage was written. In tracing the development of the ancient tradition, Myres distinguishes between real Pelasgians and theoretical Pelasgians. He shows how Hesiod and later genealogical poets depart from the denotative

Homeric evidence of real Pelasgians as a specific North Aegean people and develop theoretical Pelasgians in various parts of Greece. Myres also touches upon the relationship between the Pelasgians and the Tyrrhenians. Myres' article is especially helpful in understanding each of the important contributions to the Greeks' Pelasgian theory from Homer to Ephoros.

There are many other views and methods of investigation. Citing Herodotus especially, J.A.R. Munro ("Pelasgians and Ionians," JHS LIV, 1934, pp. 109-128) considers all the Ionians to have been originally Pelasgian and maintains that the Pelasgians once inhabited the whole area from the Euxine to the Adriatic. When the Thracians invaded Thrace from the north, they broke through the center and divided the Pelasgians into two parts. One continued to inhabit Thessaly, but the eastern faction lived around the Black Sea and later fought for Priam in the Trojan War. Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff claims that the Pelasgians are historically unreal. They represent only a popular concept of the original inhabitants of Greece (Glaube der Hellenen I, 1931, pp. 66-63). H. Bengtson identifies the Pelasgians, as well as the Carians and Leleges, with the pre-Indo-European population of the Mediterranean. Modern historians call this population Aegean. Bengtson adds that the Greeks were the descendents of these original inhabitants and the Indo-European tribes which invaded later (Griechische Geschichte, 1950, p. 29).

Paul Kretschmer seeks to substantiate archaeological conclusions about the earliest inhabitants of Greece with linguistic evidence. He distinguishes three population layers in the Aegean: a non-Indo-European layer, a proto-Indo-European layer, which represents the era of Minoan culture, and the Indo-European layer which was formed in Greece by the migrating Hellenes. The first two layers correspond respectively to the Anatolian and the band-ceramic layers documented by archaeological finds. Kretschmer identifies the Pelasgians with the middle population layer, the layer which is also represented by elements in Etruscan, Lycian, and Lydian civilizations; see Kretschmer's several articles, e.g. "Die Protoindogermanische Schicht," Glotta XIV, 1925, pp. 300-319; "Die vorgriechischen Sprach- und Volksschichten," Glotta XXVIII, 1940, pp. 231-278, and continued in Glotta XXX, 1943, pp. 84-128.

Recent concern with the Pelasgians has also been mainly linguistic. Vladimir Georgiev investigates the names of the major rivers in Greece, the names current about 450 B.C., and recognizes two main linguistic layers, Greek and Pelasgian. "Pelasgian" he defines as the pre-Greek Indo-European language of the Aegeans. Its main characteristic is a sound shift similar to that found in the Armenian and Germanic languages; see his article "Die Herkunft der Namen der grössten Flüsse der Balkanhalbinsel und ihre Bedeutung zur Ethnogenese der Balkanvölker," Balkansko Ezikozmanie I, 1959, pp. 5-16. A. J. van Windekens, like Georgiev, designates a pre-Greek

Indo-European language as "Pelasgian." He does this "only because in Greek and Latin sources this is the general name for the predecessors of the Greeks and Italics"[1]; see his article "The Name of the Pelasgians," Names VI, 1958, pp. 184-186. In his many other studies (for example, "Pelasgisch und Westindogermanisch. Neues Material," Sprache IV, 1958, pp. 128-138, and Études Pelasgiques, 1960) van Windekens reconstructs the phonology and presents extensive vocabularies for this still hypothetical Pelasgian language. Janos Harmatta also accepts the terminology of Georgiev and van Windekens and sets out to examine the Pelasgian language on the basis of the history of sounds and the phonym system; see his article "Das Pelasgische und die alten Balkansprachen," Balkansko Ezikozmanie IX, 1, 1964 pp. 41-47.

Continuing this recent trend of scholarship, Fritz Lochner-Hüttenbach undertakes to examine whether or not the pre-Greek Indo-European language of Georgiev and others can be properly called Pelasgian. "Es muss nachgeprüft werden, inwieweit diese vorgriechische Sprache mit den Pelasgern zusammengebracht werden kann. . . ."[2]: Die Pelasger, 1960. This book is especially useful since it presents an extensive collection of the ancient evidence concerning the Pelasgians. Günter Neumann in his review of the book says the collection

---

1. A. J. van Windekens, "The Name of the Pelasgians," Names, VI, 1958, p. 184.
2. Fritz Lochner-Hüttenbach, Die Pelasger, Graz, Institut für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft; Wien: Gerold & Co., 1960, p. 97.

is more complete than any other available.[1] *Lochner-Hüttenbach attempts through critical analysis of the evidence to describe the spread of the Pelasgians; and he limits their actual existence in Greece to Thessaly, Epirus, Attica, northern Peloponnesus, Crete, perhaps to a few of the islands such as Lesbos, to the Troad and the Chalcidice. He also maintains that they were present in Italy. Then, using linguistic evidence, names in particular, Lochner-Hüttenbach supports the view that the Pelasgians were originally Illyrians.*

Thus modern historians and linguists have attempted to identify the Pelasgians, to associate them with a particular place or a particular culture or a particular language. With the exceptions of Meyer and Myres, they have used ancient evidence to isolate historical or linguistic facts without considering whether or where there is unity within the ancient tradition itself.

---

1. Günter Neumann, Gnomon, 34, 1962, pp. 370-374.

CHAPTER I

THE PELASGIANS AS GREEKS

From the beginning of the classical literary tradition, the Greeks considered the Pelasgians to have been an ancient, even pre-historic, people. By the fifth century, they were also considered to have been Greek.

As early as Homer the Pelasgians were only a memory in Greece. The poet speaks of actual Pelasgians from Larisa fighting for Priam during the Trojan War (T-1)[1]. Also, Odysseus describes Crete and mentions among the island's inhabitants the "noble Pelasgians" (T-2), but Homer never refers to actual Pelasgian people or fighters from Greece. He uses the attributive form Pelasgikos when he is talking about something relevant to the Pelasgians in Greece. Thessaly is called Pelasgian Argos (T-3), and Achilles invokes the aid of Pelasgian Zeus at Dodona (T-4). As Myres points out[2], by the time of Homer there were probably no Pelasgians living in Pelasgian Argos or in the area around Dodona, for

---

1. John L. Myres, "A History of the Pelasgian Theory," JHS, 27, 1907, pp. 170-225, after considering the geographical progression in the Trojan Catalogue, locates the Pelasgian allies of Priam between the Hellespont at Sestos and Thrace. The place name Larisa was so common in the Aegean that it is of no practical use as a landmark.
2. Ibid., p. 178.

Myrmidons, Hellenes, and Achaeans inhabited Pelasgian Argos (T-3); and Perrhaebians and Enienes inhabited the area around Dodona(T-5). Thus the adjective must describe attributes familiar to the poet from Pelasgians he knew; or, more likely since Homer never specifies any peculiar Pelasgian characteristics, the adjective must describe something that was once Pelasgian. In other words, although Homer is acquainted with the contemporary inhabitants of Thessaly, he probably believes that Pelasgians used to live there and uses the term Pelasgian to mean "ancient" or "prehistoric," or as Myres also suggests, "pre-Achaean."[1] Concerning Achilles' invocation to Pelasgian Zeus, certainly it was a veneration traditional among Achilles' own people. The leader of the Myrmidons would hardly have called upon a god of the Pelasgian people. Thus the term Pelasgian could also mean something that was handed down from ancient, that is, in Thessaly at least, from Pelasgian times.[2]

The concept of the Pelasgians as the first inhabitants of Greece is, however, only suggested in Homeric epic. Hesiod first expresses this idea clearly when he describes Pelasgos, the founder and eponym of the Pelasgian race, as autochthonous (T-6). Asios carries the concept even further(T-7). He represents Pelasgos as the son of earth, the father of all mortals.

---

1. Ibid., p. 181.
2. Ibid., p. 180.

By the fifth century B.C. common Greek tradition considered the Pelasgians the earliest inhabitants of Hellas. The Suppliants of Aeschylus presents Pelasgos, the son of Palaichthon, as the king of all Greece. His realm extends in the north to the river Strymon and the land of the Perrhaebians, but its center is Argos, where the Danaids arrive and where Pelasgos himself lives (T-8). According to Herodotus, i.1.2, Argos was also the center of Greece when the Phoenicians sailed as traders and committed the fateful kidnapping of Io (see Chapter V for discussion of the Pelasgians in the Peloponnesus. In The Suppliants King Pelasgos is not a particularized ruler with a mythos of his own, but a representative of the Pelasgian nation. He is the eponymous hero of his people and, as the son of Palaichthon, aboriginal. Similarly, Danaus is not important in the play as an individual hero, but as the eponymous hero of the Danaans, and as the father of the Danaids. Thus two groups of people are juxtaposed, the Pelasgians, the original inhabitants of Greece, and the Danaids, who ask to be accepted as suppliants and whose name is known to have prevailed over the Pelasgian name.

Another general assumption of fifth century thought emerges from The Suppliants, namely the assumption that the Pelasgians were Greeks. There is a continuity of population between the Pelasgians and the Danaans. As the earliest inhabitants of Hellas, the Pelasgians were among the ancestors

of the Greeks; they were not a foreign people. King Pelasgos refers to his country as Hellenic (T-8), and only after an extensive conversation with the strange women in foreign garb, does the incredulous king finally accept the Danaids as true Argives. Their descent from Io through Epaphos, Libya, Belos, Aegyptos, and Danaus convinces King Pelasgos (T-9). The Danaids hold this pedigree in the foreground throughout the play. They appeal to their ancestor Io three times (lines 40ff, 162, 175) in their opening songs, several additional times in the middle of the play, and again in their last chorus. Io was both the ancestor of the Danaids and a predecessor of the Pelasgians in Argos. Thus Danaus was as much a Pelasgian as Pelasgos. The fifth century Athenian audience knew well that the Pelasgian Argives later came to be known as Danaans, but they did not consider a change of population to be a necessary corollary. Note for example, the different names of the Athenians under different kings in Herodotus viii.44.2. This point becomes even clearer when Danaus remarks about his own foreign appearance that the Nile does not produce a race similar to the race of Inachus, in other words, similar to the Pelasgians in Argos (T-10). The audience knew that Inachus was the father of Io and, therefore, a direct ancestor of Danaus and his daughters. The Danaids, as they insisted throughout <u>The Suppliants</u>, belonged to the same people to which the Pelasgians belonged.

The Pelasgians were not, to be sure, Hellenes, for this name was current only after the Dorian invasion; but they were a part of what might be called the 'Greek national tradition.' Just as there is a continuity of population, there is also a continuity of religious institutions from Pelasgian times to heroic times. Homer implies such a continuity when Achilles calls upon Pelasgian Zeus. Herodotus ii.48-58 extends the continuity into the fifth century when he describes the Pelasgian establishment of the oracle at Dodona and the introduction of Hermes statues by Pelasgians to the Greeks (see Chapters III and IV). In <u>*The Suppliants*</u>*, Danaus instructs his daughters to appeal to the gods they find in Argos, among them Hermes, according to the customs of the Hellenes* (T-11). *The appellation* <u>*Hellene*</u> *is, strictly speaking, anachronistic, as well as King Pelasgos' reference to his country as Hellenic. Nevertheless, by such anachronisms, Aeschylus demonstrates that the Pelasgians represent the continuous Greek culture and religion, and the Danaids, the seemingly foreign intruders.*

In the <u>*Orestes*</u> *Euripides mentions the succession of Danaus to the rule of Argos and the resulting change of the name of the Argives from Pelasgians to Danaans* (T-12). *Thus Euripides accepts the assumption which was the basis of Aeschylus' trilogy in which* <u>*The Suppliants*</u> *is probably the first play. That assumption is that Pelasgians inhabited Argos before Dannans, but both are of the same race. The name,*

not the population changed. Therefore, Euripides can refer to Danaans, that is to Argives at the time of the Seven against Thebes and even of Orestes, as Pelasgians.

In fact, Euripides often refers to Argos and Argive heroes of both before and just after the Trojan War as Pelasgian. In The Heraclidae and the Heracles, for example, Eurystheus' people and land respectively are called Pelasgian (T-13 & T-14). Antigone and the chorus of beleagured Thebans in the Phoenissiae call the Argive army and Argos itself Pelasgian (T-15). In the Orestes the Pelasgian people sentence Electra and her brother to death on the same day (T-12). Euripides perhaps uses the name Pelasgian, as did Homer, to connote something ancient and far-removed from contemporary life. Yet the name is applied to participants in events of traditional Greek history. The Pelasgians in Euripides' plays are certainly Greeks.

Thucydides seems to have been the first to separate clearly Greek nationality or race from the name Hellene (T-16). In so doing the historian distinctly classifies the Pelasgians as Greeks. For according to Thucydides, before the Trojan War the Greeks did not undertake any expedition in common. It seems to Thucydides, moreover, that there was not even a common name for Greece before the time of Hellen, the son of Deukalion; the various tribes provided names for their people and their land, especially the Pelasgian tribe. As Hellen and his sons grew strong in Phthiotis and as they were

called upon to be allies of other cities, the name Hellenes slowly spread throughout Greece. Thucydides cites Homer as evidence of this theory. For although Homer lived long after the Trojan War, he still does not call any of the Greeks Hellenes except those who fought under Achilles. Thus the Pelasgians were not Hellenic; but neither were they racially, or one might say nationally, essentially different from the Greeks who participated in the Trojan War.

Herodotus introduces (i.56) another aspect of Pelasgian identity as Greeks, namely, their association with the Ionians in Athens. Croesus, hoping to conclude an alliance with one of the Greek cities, inquired concerning the most powerful of the Hellenes. He learned that the Athenians and the Lacedaimonians were superior among the Greeks. The latter were Dorians; the former, Ionians. Herodotus then adds information to explain this answer. This information is introduced by gar, and thus was apparently accepted at the time and was not uncovered by his own investigations. Herodotus does not present any divergent opinions. The Dorians were a Hellenic people and the Ionians were originally Pelasgian. Furthermore, while the one race never left its home, The Dorians were constantly on the move. This statement of the Ionians' continuous abode in Attica must be considered more fully. Common fifth century tradition claimed not only that the Pelasgians were the oldest inhabitants of Greece and among the ancestors of the Greek heroes. It also claimed that the Athenians had always inhabited Attica. The

Athenian envoy to Gelon of Syracuse in Herodotus vii.161.3 refuted Gelon's offer of military support in the Persian War in return for command of the Greek fleet. This would have dishonored the Athenians, the most ancient of all Greek peoples. Thucydides also affirms that Attica never changed its inhabitants (T-17). However, in Herodotus i.56, the Athenians' autochthony seems to be connected with their Pelasgian identity. Herodotus does not emphasize the connection nor describe how it came about. Indeed, it is merely assumed. If, as Hesiod and Asios say, the Pelasgians were the original inhabitants of Greece, and if, as the Athenians themselves claim, Athenians had always inhabited Attica, certainly it is logical to assume that the Athenians were originally Pelasgian. Nonetheless, it is important to distinguish these two aspects of Athenian nationality and to note that by the time of Herodotus both were a part of traditional history.

From Herodotus i.171-173 it seems clear that other early peoples in the Aegean, the Leleges, Carians and Lycians in particular, are sharply distinguished in the fifth century from the Pelasgians. In the first place, neither of these three races is connected geographically with Greece. Although there is an ancient dispute about the original homeland of the Carians, there is no suggestion that the Carians inhabited the Greek mainland. Thucydides supports the view presented in Herodotus that the Carians were originally islanders, and does not suggest that there were ever Carians in Greece (T-18). The Lycians, according to Herodotus, were originally from Crete. Herodotus adds by way of explanation that Crete was formerly inhabited by

barbarians. Secondly, unlike the Pelasgians, neither the Lycians nor the Carians played an integral part in early Greek history. The Lycians did receive their name from the Athenian Lycus, but only after they had moved from Crete to Asia and only after Lycus had been banished from Athens. Moreover, they did not, like the Pelasgians in Greece, become Danaans or Athenians. The Carians, too, remained outside traditional Greek history. There are only two instances of early involvement between Greeks and Carians in Herodotus. First, the Hellenes adopted three Carian inventions for better battle equipment. Second, according to Herodotus v.66, one illustrious Athenian family sacrificed to Carian Zeus. Unfortunately, Herodotus does not know the history of this family, nor does he report why its members honored the Carian god. It is clear that this practice was an anomaly. Unlike the Pelasgians and the Greeks, the Carians and Greeks were always separate peoples with separate cultures. Nor is there any connection in ancient sources up to the fifth century between the Pelasgians and the Leleges, Carians, or Lycians.

Hekataios from Miletus says that barbarians inhabited the Peloponnesus before the Hellenes (T-19). However, Thucydides points out that Homer did not use the term <u>barbarian</u>, probably because the Greeks were not yet distinguished from the rest of the world by one name (T-16). Hence, it is not altogether clear how <u>barbarian</u> is to be understood as applied to the inhabitants of Greece before the Dorian

invasion. Did Hekataios mean that the early Argives were of radically different stock from the later Helleneś? Or would he have agreed with Aeschylus and Thucydides that the Pelasgians and other early peoples were in fact Greeks, if not yet Hellenes? It seems impossible to decide from this one meagre fragment. Certainly Hekataios considers the Pelasgians who were expelled from Athens following the Trojan War to have been non-Greek (see Herodotus vi.137 for the preserved fragment). Perhaps he concluded from his opinions about this group that all Pelasgians were foreigners among Greeks, in other words, barbarians.

There is another problem of terminology in reference to the pre-Hellenic Greeks. How should an ancient author address all the forces who accompanied Agamemnon to Troy? No particular tribal name - Danaans, Argives, Achaeans, Hellenes - includes all the Greek warriors. Again Thucydides is first of the ancients to consider this matter (T-16). Each tribe had its own name and no tribal name had general significance until after the time of Hellen and his sons. Thus there was no inclusive name for the pre-Hellenic Greeks. It seems that Hekataios could not distinguish the pre-Hellenic Argives from the Hellenic Argives except by the categories barbarian and Hellene.

Summarizing the evolution of the concept of the Pelasgians as Greeks, at the time of Homer the term <u>*Pelasgian*</u> *designates something very old, something primeval. Then in Hesiod and Asios this idea of antiquity is extended so that*

Pelasgos is the original man and his people the original inhabitants of Greece. This extension next becomes a common assumption in the fifth century, as is demonstrated by Aeschylus' play, The Suppliants, in which Pelasgos, son of Palaichthon, rules over all Greece. It also becomes clear from The Suppliants that the Pelasgians were considered to be a Greek people. Aeschylus implies a continuity of population, as well as of culture, from Pelasgian to heroic times. Euripides, too, accepts the idea that the Pelasgians changed their name to Danaans, but were always the same people. Indeed, the poets of the fifth century never considered the question of whether or not there was any significant racial, linguistic, or cultural difference between Pelasgians and the heroic Greeks. They assumed that the earliest people in Greece, the Pelasgians, were among their ancestors and, therefore, essentially the same as themselves.

Thucydides first separates clearly the possession of Greek nationality from the name Hellene and thereby classifies the Pelasgians among the early Greeks. Herodotus presents another assumption of fifth century theory about the Pelasgians. Not only were they the oldest inhabitants of Greece, but also the Athenians, being autochthonous, were in particular a Pelasgian race. No other Aegean people holds a position in Greek tradition similar to the Pelasgians. The Carians and Lycians, for example, are treated by Herodotus and Thucydides as peoples outside the realm of national Greek

history. Hekataios first questions the traditional assumption that the Pelasgians were Greeks. He calls all the pre-Hellenes of the Peloponnesus barbarians. But there are two problems of terminology with the word barbarian which Thucydides recognizes and which make Hekataios' classification confusing. Herodotus takes up the question of whether the Pelasgians were barbarian when he investigates the Pelasgian language.

CHAPTER II

THE PELASGIAN LANGUAGE

After recording contemporary views about the origins of the Athenians and the Lacedaimonians (see pages 13-14 above), Herodotus proceeds in i.57-58 to offer information about the Pelasgian language based upon his own observations. At the outset Herodotus admits that he cannot say with certainty what language the Pelasgians used. But his method of investigation is quite scientific. He studies the language of contemporary Pelasgians who live above the Tyrrhenians in Kreston and in Placia and Skylace on the Hellespont. These cities, though not bordering one another, share a common language which is different from their immediate neighbors. Herodotus then concludes that if the contemporary Pelasgian language is proper evidence for the language of the ancient Pelasgians, the ancient Pelasgians spoke a barbarian tongue. Furthermore, if all Pelasgians spoke alike, the Athenians, being originally a Pelasgian people, must have learned a new language upon becoming Hellenes. The Hellenic people, on the other hand, always used the same language.

Exactly what does Herodotus mean when he designates the Pelasgian language barbarian? It seems probable that Herodotus uses the term (as does Hekataios) only as a means of contrast with the prevailing Hellenic language of his

own time. For he is, it must be remembered, comparing contemporary Pelasgian speech with contemporary Greek. Herodotus knows, however, that the Hellenes always used the same language and that early Pelasgians and early Dorians were once neighbors in Thessaly. He may well have assumed that the linguistic differences were the same in ancient times and that Pelasgian, being non-Hellenic, was therefore barbarian.

Another question arises from Herodotus' account of the Pelasgian language. Might classification as barbarian mean that Pelasgian is different from the Hellenic language as, for example, Danish is different from German? Or does Herodotus mean to distinguish two radically different languages such as Polish and French? In trying to answer these questions, consider Herodotus i.142. There Herodotus discusses the four different languages of the Ionians in Asia Minor. He uses the same comparative method he uses with the Pelasgian language and some of the same terminology. The three Ionian cities in Caria - Miletus, Myus, and Priene - speak a common language. So do the six Ionian cities in Lydia, namely, Ephesos, Colophon, Lebedos, Teos, Clazomenae, and Phocaea. But the two groups of cities do not resemble each other in language. Of the three remaining Ionian cities, Chios and Erythrae share a language and the Samians use their own peculiar tongue. These then, are the four types of language in Ionia. Although all the Ionians certainly spoke Greek

and varied only dialectically, the same phrase, "type of language," is used to differentiate Pelasgian from neighboring languages. Thus it seems possible that Herodotus may have distinguished Pelasgian and Hellenic which also varied only dialectically. The two languages might, in other words have been as closely related as German and Danish. Nevertheless, Herodotus does not claim that any of the Ionians spoke a barbarian tongue, and it seems impossible to discover exactly what aspects of Pelasgian prompted him to classify that language as he did. Variations between homoglosses and homophoneo do not seem to be significant in this question. Perhaps all one can say is that Herodotus found that users of Pelasgian and Hellenic were unintelligible to one another.

Herodotus also describes in i.58 how the Hellenic tribe was weak as long as it was separate from the Pelasgians and how the Hellenes, by combining with the Pelasgians and with many other barbarians, grew into a multitude of peoples. He then concludes with his own opinion that the Pelasgian race, being barbarian, was never very powerful. The designation of the Pelasgians as barbarians seems to follow from Herodotus' own conclusions about the Pelasgian language. He does not say that they were barbarian in i.56.2. There he explains his contemporaries' assumptions about the origins of the Athenians. In the next chapter, i.57, Herodotus investigates the Pelasgian language and decides that it is barbarian. Therefore, he concludes in i.58, the Pelasgians

themselves must have been barbarians. Like Hekataios, Herodotus does not seem to have had an alternate term for something non-Hellenic, even though possibly still Greek. It might even be suggested that Herodotus was familiar with Hekataios' classification of all pre-Hellenic Peloponnesians as barbarians and knowingly substantiates the viewpoint of Hekataios with his own research.

There are two passages in Thucydides which also concern the pre-Hellenic language of Greece. In one (T-20), *Thucydides implies that the pre-Dorian Argive heroes did not speak Greek, but were, as far as language is concerned, barbarian. Amphilochos returned from the Trojan War to his home in Argos. Not being satisfied with the conditions he found there, he left Argos and established several colonies on the Ambracian Gulf. One colony, named Argos after the homeland, became the largest and most powerful city in Amphilochia. Many generations later, however, under the pressure of adverse circumstance, the Amphilochian Argives called on their neighbors, the Ambraciots, to join their colony. From the Ambraciots the colonists first learned the Hellenic language, for the rest of the Amphilochians were barbarian. Thucydides describes in this passage the same kind of dichotomy between the Hellenic and barbarian languages which Herodotus does in i.57. The pre-Hellenic Argives, one of whom founded colonies on the Ambracian gulf, spoke a barbarian tongue. Yet from Thucydides' own account*

of the spread of the Hellenic name in Book i.3 (see the discussion on pages 12-13, 16), it seems fair to assume that Thucydides would designate the pre-Hellenic language of Argos as barbarian only in contrast to the Hellenic language itself. He did not mean that it was necessarily non-Greek.

Thucydides also raises the question of whether the spread of the Hellenic language was concurrent with the spread of the Hellenic name (T-16).

> It appears therefore that the several Hellenic communities, comprising not only those who first acquired the name, city by city, as they came to understand each other, but also those who assumed it afterwards as the name of the whole people, were before the Trojan War prevented from their want of strength and the absence of mutual intercourse from displaying any collective action.[1]

If the phrase "to understand each other" means that the Greeks learned to use a common language, an interpretation supported by Gomme in his commentary, then this passage suggests that the Hellenic name and the Hellenic language spread at about the same rate to the same people. Consequently, since the Hellenic name did not become common till after the Trojan War, most of Greece during the Heroic Age must have been barbarian in its language. If the Herodotean passage i.57 is interpreted within the categories for barbarian and Hellenic languages which Thucydides employs, it is quite possible to

---

1. Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, trans. Crawley, Modern Library; New York: Random House, 1951, p. 5.

consider the Pelasgians as non-Hellenes speaking a barbarian tongue and, at the same time, as Greeks.

The only other ancient author to comment upon the language of the Pelasgians was Dionysius of Halicarnassus. That he was familiar with Herodotus' method of comparing languages is certain; he quotes Herodotus i.57 directly in his own argument for the linguistic difference between the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians in Italy (T-21). However, Dionysius follows a later tradition that the Pelasgians were originally Hellenic and from the Peloponnesus (T-22), see Chapter V. Thus he already knows what language the Pelasgians spoke, namely, Greek. Dionysius reports how the Aborigines allotted the Pelasgians some marshy land near Velia in Italy. He uses the place-name Velia then to comment upon the occurrence of the digamma in the early Hellenic language, the language which the Pelasgians also used. He even describes how the digamma was written and offers some examples such as wanax and woikos (T-23). Although one notes that Dionysius assumed the Pelasgians to have spoken Greek, his comment upon the Pelasgian language and the one letter of their alphabet is not very helpful in understanding the account of Herodotus.

There is a curious passage in Diodorus which is also concerned with the letters of the alphabet (T-24). Diodorus states that the Phoenician alphabet was adapted to the Greek language by Linus. The letters were called in common, or as

a group (koinei), Phoenician, because of their origin. However, since the Pelasgians were the first to use the adapted letters, in private or individually (idiai), the letters were called Pelasgian. It is unclear exactly what koinos and idios mean in this context. C. H. Oldfather translates the two words 'as a group' and 'individually'[1] It may mean 'officially' and 'privately.' But the distinction is obscure. It is also uncertain where Diodorus heard or read that the letters were sometimes called Pelasgian. There is no association of Pelasgians with the Phoenician alphabet in fifth century tradition. Herodotus' account of the introduction of Cadmeian letters to Greece is entirely divorced from any Pelasgian stories (v.58-59). In fact, Herodotus reports that when the Phoenicians arrived with Cadmus, Ionians, not Pelasgians, inhabited most of the country around Boeotia and began to use the letters with only a few changes. The Diodorus passage remains a puzzle. It can only be noted that if the Pelasgians were the first to use the letters adapted by Linus to the Greek language, Diodorus, like Dionysius, believes that the Pelasgians spoke Greek.

In summary, Herodotus claims that the Pelasgians spoke a barbarian language. However, he bases this claim upon a comparison of contemporary Pelasgian with contemporary

---

1. Diodorus Siculus, iii.67.1, trans. C. H. Oldfather, Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Hellenic. Whether or not Pelasgian was closely related to Hellenic is impossible to decide from the Herodotean account; Herodotus probably did not even concern himself with such a question. The designation of the Pelasgian race as barbarian, is probably Herodotus' own conclusion from his views of the Pelasgian language. Thucydides implies that most pre-Hellenic Greeks spoke a barbarian language. But, like Herodotus, Thucydides uses the term barbarian only in contrast to the term Hellenic. It does not necessarily mean non-Greek. Both Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diodorus Siculus agree that the Pelasgians spoke an early form of Greek. However, their respective accounts of the digamma and of Pelasgian letters offer little insight into the fifth century B.C. views of either the alphabet or the Pelasgian language.

CHAPTER III

THE TRANSMISSION OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS BY THE PELASGIANS

The only source dealing with the Pelasgians' role in transmitting certain religious institutions to the Hellenes is Herodotus. His opinions on this subject are based on the answers to his extensive queries and investigations in Greece and Egypt. No single contemporary assumption forms the basis of his thought. Another aspect of the stories to be presented here is the significance of the Pelasgians' involvement with the Greeks. What the Pelasgians themselves accomplished is not so important as what the Greeks received from them. In other words, the role of the Pelasgians in the transmission of certain religious practices is not important in itself, but only as an explanation of the origins of certain Hellenic practices.

Throughout Greek literature the oracle at Dodona is regarded as a Pelasgian foundation. One will recall the Homeric passage in which Achilles invokes the aid of Pelasgian Zeus at Dodona (T-4). Hesiod calls the oak of Dodona the seat of the Pelasgians (T-25). According to Homer, the oak tree, which grows in the Trojan plain, is also associated with Zeus (T-26). Ephorus, too, believes that Dodona was the abode of Pelasgians (T-27). From Herodotus ii.52.2, it is

clear that by the fifth century B.C. Dodona was also generally considered to be the oldest oracle in Greece. The Pelasgian foundation probably achieved this distinction through much the same process by which the Pelasgians themselves came to be considered the original inhabitants of Greece (see Chapter I).

Herodotus presents two versions of the founding of the oracle at Dodona (ii.54-55). One version he learned from the priests of Theban Zeus in Egypt; the other, from the priestesses at Dodona. In ii.56-57 Herodotus then rationalizes the Dodona version to agree with the account he heard and basically accepted in Egypt. Part of what the priestesses say in Dodona, namely the association of the oracle's founding with the oak tree, is obviously the same ancient Greek tradition alluded to in Homer and mentioned specifically in Hesiod. The black doves are probably also a part of genuine tradition. They are an integral part of the priestesses' myth, and they do not appear in the Egyptian account. The assertion that the doves flew away from Egypt, however, is not a necessary part of the myth, nor is the claim of an Egyptian source for the oracle mentioned outside of Herodotus. Herodotus notes basic similarities between the oracles in Egypt and Dodona (ii.57.3), as he notes similarities between the Egyptian and Greek worship of Dionysus. Considering chance similarities extremely unlikely and impressed by the antiquity of Egyptian institutions in general, particularly

the Dionysus rites, Herodotus concludes that the Egyptians borrowed nothing from the Greeks, but that the Greeks learned much from the Egyptians (ii.49). Thus Herodotus finds the explanation of similarities between Dodona and oracles in Egypt in the assumption of an Egyptian origin for the Greek oracle. As the priestesses were telling about the founding of their oracle, Herodotus might have asked where the black dove came from. Finding no answer in tradition, perhaps he suggested that the dove came from Egypt. The priestesses then incorporated this suggestion into their own account. This is, of course, only supposition. Herodotus does, in fact, present two stories about the oracle of Dodona. One, a traditional Greek story, said that the oracle was Pelasgian. The other, which he heard in Egypt, claimed that the oracle was Egyptian. Herodotus connects the two accounts and rationalizes their discrepancies.

Herodotus ii.50 and ii.52 describe how the Pelasgians learned the names of the individual gods from Egypt. This discussion, like Herodotus' investigations of the oracle at Dodona, is part of a general consideration of the origins of several elements in Greek civilization. It, too, represents a combination of Greek tradition and what Herodotus learned in Egypt. Herodotus knows, having heard in Dodona, that the Pelasgians did not at first distinguish the various gods by name, but worshipped them all together as <u>theoi</u>. After a long time, the Pelasgians learned the individual names for the

gods. The source of these names is not a part of the Dodona account. Although this story occurs only in Herodotus, the fact that he heard it in Dodona indicates that it was probably a part of the traditional history of the oracle.

Herodotus also knows that the names came from barbarians. He had discovered this fact by making inquiries; where he inquired is not certain, perhaps at Dodona itself. He then concludes that it is most likely the names came from Egypt. For, as the Egyptians themselves say, with several exceptions, the names of the gods had always been known there. As in the case of the oracle at Dodona, Herodotus combines Greek tradition, in both cases tradition which he heard at Dodona, with knowledge and observations he gained from his travels in Egypt.

The obvious difficulty in accepting the Herodotean account is the fact that the Egyptian names for the gods are completely different from the Greek ones. Yet Herodotus does not imply that the names changed between the time of their adoption by the Pelasgians and their transmission to the Hellenes. Throughout the second book Herodotus calls the gods by their Greek names. Only occasionally does he mention the Egyptian equivalent. For some gods, Heracles for example, he does not mention the Egyptian name at all. Herodotus seems to assume that there was no essential difference between the Egyptian and Greek deities. The names Ammon and

Zeus, for example, represent a single absolute being.[1] *When the Libyans were instructed to establish an oracle of Ammon, Herodotus says it means to establish an oracle of Zeus (ii.55.3). In other words, he identifies Ammon and Zeus without qualification. To Herodotus, different names symbolize the same individual beings "whose reality was as axiomatic to him as their unreality is to us."*[2] *There is no importance in the actual name, but in the recognition of the various individual deities by distinguishing names. This is precisely what the Pelasgians first learned to do, according to Herodotus, from the Egyptians. For before they learned names, they worshipped all the gods together simply as gods. None was an individual being. Ivan M. Linforth says:*

> *For this individualization the first necessity was names: to name a god was to recognize him as an individual, to learn the name of a god from a foreign people was to learn to recognize him as an individual, whether the actual word used as a name by the foreign people was adopted or a totally different word substituted for it.*[3]

When Herodotus says the Greeks learned the name of Heracles from the Egyptians (ii.43), he means that the Greeks learned to recognize this particular god as an individual being. The same is true concerning the ounomata the Pelasgians learned from Egypt. Herodotus could have said, as he did of Poseidon, that the Greeks learned the god from the Egyptians

---

1. Ivan M. Linforth, "Greek Gods and Foreign Gods in Herodotus," University of California Publications in Classical Philology, IX, 1, 1926, pp. 1-25.
2. Ibid. p., 18.
3. Ibid. p., 19.

(ii.50). Although Linforth is certainly correct in his interpretation of the Herodotean passage, the question remains why the word ounoma is used so strangely.

Herodotus mentions one last religious practice which the Pelasgians learned from the Egyptians, the rite of Demeter (ii.171). The daughters of Danaus brought this rite with them to the Peloponnesus and taught it to the Pelasgian women whom they encountered there. In their commentary on this passage, W. W. How and J. Wells maintain that Herodotus derived the rite of Demeter from Egypt "because he identifies Isis with Demeter."[1] Herodotus certainly does identify the two goddesses in ii.59.2. Where he learned that the Danaids transported knowledge of the Demeter rite is uncertain. It is possible that he heard such a story from the priests in Egypt. Perhaps the story is from Attic drama. At any rate, Hellenes learned the rite from the Arcadians, a Pelasgian people (i.146) who alone remained undisturbed during the Dorian invasions and thus could preserve its practice.

With these accounts in Book ii, Herodotus explains the origins of certain aspects of Greek religion. He learned many stories from the priests in Egypt and was deeply impressed by the antiquity of what he observed, as well as by the many similarities between the gods and oracles of Egypt and Greece. Herodotus also inquired of the priestesses of Dodona about the foundation of their oracle and about the gods the Greeks

---

1. W. W. How and J. Wells, A Commentary on Herodotus, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1964, I, p. 251.

worshipped. He then connects the histories he heard from both places; he adds to the traditional Greek accounts the interpretations and opinions he formed in Egypt. Thus Herodotus believes there was a continuous observance of certain religious practices which the Pelasgians learned from the Egyptians and the Greeks from the Pelasgians. Each people adopted the oracles, the names of the gods, and the Demeter rites as its own. Not until much later, however, does Herodotus think the Hellenes gained complete knowledge about each of the gods, about each god's birth and his physical attributes. For Homer and Hesiod first develop the basic knowledge handed down from the Pelasgians into a unified theogony. They are the first to ascribe to each god particular epithets and skills (ii.53).

CHAPTER IV

THE PELASGIANS IN ATTICA

Early Athenian history is known from Herodotus and Thucydides only in bare outlines. Thucydides' account in the "Archaeologia" (T-17) does not discuss any specific personages or events. In Book ii (T-28a) Thucydides does name Cecrops, Erechtheus, and Theseus; and he does mention specific occurrences during their reigns. But nowhere in Thucydides is there a list of early Athenian kings or a complete chronological account of Athenian history. Indeed, one would hardly expect to find such an account in a history of the Peloponnesian War. More striking, Thucydides never says that the Athenians were originally Pelasgian. He mentions only once that some contemporary Pelasgians used to live in Athens (T-28b). Thucydides does not deny that the Athenians were Pelasgian; he just never discusses the question.

The Herodotean account of early Athenian history is similarly sketchy and incomplete. However, Herodotus does associate the Pelasgians with the Athenians. How two aspects of Athenian nationality, namely, their identity as Pelasgians and their claim to be the most ancient of all the Greeks, was combined has already been discussed (see Chapter I, pages 13-14). In viii.44.2, Herodotus again states that the early

Athenians were Pelasgians and records the different names by which the Athenians were known at different times. There was never a sudden change in the population of Attica, only in their name. As in i.46, Herodotus does not tell his readers how he knows that the Athenians were Pelasgian. It seems to have been common knowledge. Another indication that Herodotus was relying upon some tradition when he talks about the name Pelasgian *and the change to* Ionian *appears in vii.94. In this passage Herodotus reports that, "as the Hellenes say," for as long as the Ionians lived in what is now called Achaea, and before the arrival of Danaus and Xuthus, the Ionians were called Pelasgians of the shore. (See Chapter V for discussion of the Pelasgians in the Peloponnesus.) Thus the general fifth century B.C. view is supported by Herodotus and by no means refuted by Thucydides. The Athenians were originally Pelasgians and changed only their name in their early history.*

Unlike the belief that the Pelasgians were the oldest Greek people, the identification of the Athenians in particular as Pelasgians appears neither in Homer nor in Hesiod, nor in the fifth century poets, not to mention Thucydides. Only Herodotus consistently assumes the identification. Eduard Meyer maintains:

> *Diese Annahme is lediglich eine Folgerung, die Herodot daraus gezogen hat, dass es Ionier erst gab, seitdem Ion der Sohn des Xuthos nach Athen gekommen war (vii.94 und viii.44); vorher, unter Kranaos, Kekrops und Erechtheus, konnten die Bewohner weder Ionier noch Hellenen sein,*

> *sie mussten also nach Herodots Anschauung Pelasger und Barbaren gewesen sein (i.56ff).*[1]

Meyer's view is certainly a reasonable interpretation of the Pelasgian identity of the Ionians and particularly of the Athenians. Since early Athenian history was so vaguely represented in Greek tradition, there was no prejudice against this assumption. On the contrary, the idea that the Pelasgians were the original inhabitants of Greece and the Athenians' claim that they had always lived in Attica seemed to be naturally connected. However, Herodotus nowhere indicates that he was the first to conclude that the Athenians were Pelasgians. Indeed, as has been discussed above, the text rather leads one to believe that Herodotus was repeating a generally accepted tradition.

What then was the source of the tradition that the Ionians were Pelasgian? Since it does not appear in Homer, Hesiod, or the playwrights, it could well have a late origin, even as late as the early fifth century. Hekataios of Miletus (see Herodotus vi.137-139 and the following discussion) has a version of a story about some Pelasgians who lived for a while under Mount Hymettos in Attica. Thus Hekataios is known to have been concerned with the Pelasgians in Athens. There is also a possibility that Hekataios' classification of all pre-Hellenes as barbarians influenced Herodotus' own investigations

---

1. *Eduard Meyer, Forschungen zur alten Geschichte, Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1892; I, p. 6.*

into the Pelasgian language (see pages 19-20). Perhaps it was Hekataios who first concluded that Ionians, especially Athenians, were originally Pelasgian and convinced Herodotus that he was right.

Herodotus records two other stories involving Pelasgians in Attica. Like the opinion that the Athenians were originally Pelasgians, neither story is represented in Homer, Hesiod, the playwrights, or Thucydides. Only Hekataios was concerned with either of them. Thus both stories could be of comparatively late origin. Eduard Meyer writes:

> Die Erzählung von den Pelasgern in Attika gehört weder dem einheimischen Sagenbestande an, noch dem was die älteren Dichter als attische Urgeschichte erzählten. Weder in der genealogischen Poesie ist von ihnen die Rede, noch im attischen Drama, noch in der traditionellen Stadtgeschichte, auf der Thukydides II.15 fusst, noch z.B. bei Aristophanes oder Plato oder wo man sonst Spuren alter und ächter einheimischer Tradition suchen könnte. Und doch fliesst grade hier die Ueberlieferung sonst reichlich und zusammenhängend genug, so dass wir diese Erscheinung nicht durch unser lückenhaftes Material erklären dürfen.[1]

The two stories are also related in two other ways. Both are etiological and recount possibly contemporary events.

Herodotus vi.137 tells about some Pelasgians who built the ancient wall around the Acropolis. As payment for their labor, they received land under Mount Hymettos in Attica. Later the Pelasgians were expelled from Athens, according to

---

1. Ibid., p. 8.

Hekataios because the Athenians begrudged them the prospering land. The Athenians, on the other hand, claim that they expelled the Pelasgians justly. For the Pelasgians were wont to attack their daughters who used to fetch water from the well called Nine Springs. The Pelasgians were even caught in the act of plotting against Athens.

It has already been noted that this story is not a part of ancient Athenian tradition. Not only does it fail to appear in the poets; but, as Meyer points out, the nature of the tale itself speaks against its antiquity. An ancient explanation of the origin of the acropolis wall would have assigned its building to one of the early founder-kings, as the Cyclopean wall in Tiryns is assigned to Proitos and as the various important events of Athen's early development are assigned to particular kings in Thucydides (T-28). This Pelasgian story, however, takes place, as will be discussed below, after the accomplishments of Cecrops, Erechtheus, and Theseus, but we do not know under which ruler. Meyer also notes:

> *Wegen des Alters der Burgmauer musste man sie möglichst hoch hinaufsetzen, aber in der eigentlichen Sagengeschichte war nirgend mehr Platz für sie; so hat man sie ans Ende derselben angeflickt.*[1]

Again the question arises, what is the source of this account? Again Hekataios seems a good possibility. Herodotus

---

1. Ibid., pp. 8-9.

first presents the Hekataian version and then the Athenian version. Perhaps Herodotus himself first learned from Hekataios that the Pelasgians built the Acropolis wall and were later expelled from Athens. He then told this story in Athens. The Athenians were willing to accept the idea that Pelasgians had built their wall; they had no contradictory explanation for its origin. But they were not willing to believe that their ancestors had behaved so wickedly towards the Pelasgians. Thus they corrected the Hekataian account with their own version.

Whatever the source of the story, it is obviously etiological. It seeks to explain who built the ancient acropolis wall, which was still serving as fortification in the time of the Peisistratidae (Herodotus v.64.2),[1] and why the builders were no longer in Athens. Eduard Meyer says the wall was known in Athens as the Pelargian Wall, a name which had nothing to do with Pelasgians.[2] There was no genuine ancient tradition connecting Pelasgians with the Athenian wall, nor is the sound change from Pelasgikon to Pelargikon paralleled in Attic Greek, where rhotacism did not occur. When the Athenians heard the account about the builders of

---

1. For a description of the "stork-fort," see Jane Ellen Harrison, Primitive Athens, as described by Thucydides, Cambridge: University Press, 1906, pp. 23-36.

2. "Seitdem in der grossen 1880 gefundenen eleusinischen Inschrift (jetz CIA I.27b) die Schreibung Pelargikon zu Tage getreten ist, ist diese Thatsache allgemein bekannt und anerkannt. Bei Thukydides II.17 schreibt die beste Handschrift (Laurentianus C) beidemale Pelargikon," (Meyer, pp. 9-10).

their Acropolis wall, whether from Hekataios or Herodotus or someone else, they accepted it. It offered a satisfactory historical explanation of the wall's origin. But they could not call their wall Pelasgian, as it was called outside of Athens. If the origin of the story is non-Attic, as has been suggested, the wall's name might have furnished the reason for the story in the first place, namely as an explanation of Pelasgikon teichos. Another story then arose among Athenians which Strabo recounts (T-29a): The Athenians called the Pelasgians storks, pelargoi, because they migrated so often. Thus the Pelasgians came to be associated with the Pelargian Wall in Athens.

What happened to the Pelasgians after they were expelled from Athens (Herodotus vi.138-140) has no direct connection with the story of their building the wall around the Acropolis. Their later exploits explain the population of Lemnos and the phrase "Lemnian Deed," and justify the subjugation of Lemnos by Miltiades many generations later. However, Herodotus narrates these various stories successively. He thereby forms a continuous account of one group of Pelasgians who came to Athens from somewhere unknown, built the Pelargian wall, and were later banished. They then settled other countries, especially Lemnos, and avenged their expulsion by kidnapping some Athenian women who were celebrating Artemis rites in Brauron. The Pelasgians were still living on Lemnos when Miltiades added that island to the Athenian empire.

Precisely because Herodotus gives a successive description of these Pelasgians and one cross reference from one story to the other, it is possible to arrive at a rough traditional date for their abode in Attica. According to Herodotus iv.145, the grandsons of the Argo crew, the Minyae, were driven out of Lemnos by the Pelasgians who later captured the women from Brauron. Thus the banishment of the Pelasgians from Attica occurred not later than the Trojan War. When they had arrived in Athens is unknown. Possibly they built the acropolis wall, cultivated the land around Mount Hymettos for a short time, and were expelled all in the same generation. Herodotus does not indicate otherwise. At any rate, it is clear that their stay in Attica and the construction of the wall was thought to have occurred during the heroic age.

Herodotus ii.51 relates the story of some Pelasgians from Samothrace who became settlers in Attica and from whom the Athenians learned to use the ithyphallic Hermes statues. In three essential points this story, for which Herodotus is the only source, resembles the account of the wall-building Pelasgians.

In the first place, both stories attempt to explain the origins of something old and strange. One group of Pelasgians built the ancient Acropolis wall. The other introduced a certain kind of Hermes statues to the Athenians, who in turn introduced them to the rest of the Greeks. These Herms had nothing to do with the Hipparchian Herms of the late sixth

century, but were older and were connected with Samothrace and the secret Cabiri rites. Herodotus also believes that the Hermes statues were originally used in Egypt and that the Pelasgians were only the middlemen between the Egyptians and the Greeks (see Chapter III).

Both stories also involve groups of Pelasgians arriving in Attica as immigrants. The fifth century tradition does not specify where the wall-building Pelasgians were thought to have come from. Since Strabo first records an answer to the question of their origin, it is possible that there was no common fifth century opinion about the matter (T-29b). There is an important difference, however, between the two groups of settlers. While the one group never became a part of the native Athenian population and was expelled altogether, the Pelasgians from Samothrace were <u>synoikoi</u> (a term never applied to those who lived under Mount Hymettos), and they came to be considered, like the Athenians, Hellenes.

The Pelasgians from Samothrace supposedly arrived in Attica when the Athenians already ranked among the Hellenes, in other words, after the time of Xuthus. Exactly when is impossible to say. Conceivably they arrived as late as the Trojan War. Thus they could have been thought to have arrived at about the same time as the Pelasgians who were responsible for building the Pelargian wall.

Eduard Meyer suggests that the Pelasgians from Samothrace and the ones who built the wall were identical.[1] This is a possible historical analysis. Certainly the two stories resemble each other closely. However, Herodotus does not indicate by any cross reference or by similar terminology that he believes the two stories to involve the same group of people. Nor is there any evidence, however tenuous, for postulating a source for the account of the Pelasgians who introduced the Hermes statues to the Greeks, as there is for the account of the other Pelasgians.

Thus it seems that the stories about Pelasgians in Attica are of relatively late origin and do not have a place in the ancient traditions about the founding of Athens and its early history. Herodotus is the earliest source for the association of Pelasgians with Athenians, though he does not seem to have associated the two peoples as a result of his own research. Rather Herodotus reports current opinions. Perhaps he first heard that the Athenians were Pelasgians and that Pelasgians built the Pelargian wall from Hekataios. Stories about Pelasgians explain the origins of two ancient and curious aspects of Athenian civilization, the wall around the Acropolis and the ithyphallic statues of Hermes. Both involve people from abroad settling in Attica. The stories

---

1. Ibid., p. 6.

might also have explained roughly contemporary events. Unfortunately, Herodotus does not demonstrate clearly whether he thought the two groups of Pelasgians represented two independent immigrations to Attica, perhaps involving only a small number of people, or whether one group of immigrants from Samothrace provided Athens with her wall as well as with the Hermes statues.

CHAPTER V

PELASGIANS IN THE PELOPONNESUS

In the fifth century B.C. viewpoint, the Pelasgians were firmly established in the traditional history of the Peloponnesus. The Danaids arrived from Egypt and found Pelasgians living in Argos (Herodotus i.171 and The Suppliants of Aeschylus). In the playwrights, Pelasgia is often a poetic synonym for Argos. One will recall the numerous examples from Euripides (T-13, 14, 15). There is an additional example in Euripides' Iphigenia in Aulus (T-30), and Aeschylus substitutes the name Pelasgia for Argos in Prometheus Bound (T-31). The Arcadians, as well as the early Argives, were considered Pelasgians (Herodotus i.146). From Strabo, it is known that Ephorus even perfected a Pelasgian theory based on the assumption that the original Pelasgians were Arcadians (T-32).

Hesiod, according to Strabo, is first to locate Pelasgians in Arcadia and thereby offers the principal support for the opinions of Ephorus (T-33). Sir John L. Myres notes that in Asios (T-7) Pelasgos, who appears for the first time not merely as one of an ancient race, but as the progenitor of

the original race, is not associated with any particular geographical place.[1] Hesiod is the first to locate Pelasgos by asserting that he was the father of Arcadian Lycaon. The Arcadians, like the Athenians, claimed that they were an autochthonous people (Herodotus viii.73). Pelasgos was considered by Hesiod and Asios to be aboriginal. Hence it was natural to connect the two assumptions and to conclude that the Arcadians were Pelasgians, much as in the case of the Athenians (see Chapter I, page 13). Pelasgos becomes the father of Lycaon, and their descendents become the original race of people. The difference between the Arcadian and Athenian claims to Pelasgian identity is the relative ages of the claims: the former dates from Hesiod, the latter first appears in Herodotus. The Hesiodic story represents a sharp departure from the Homeric tradition. In Homer there were no individual Pelasgians and the Pelasgian people inhabited only Thessaly and the area around Dodona. Nevertheless, it is an authentic part of early Hellenic tradition.

The first association between Pelasgians and Argives seems to occur in Acusilaus (T-34). There Pelasgos appears in the traditional genealogy as a son of Niobe and Zeus. After him the inhabitants of the Peloponnesus were called Pelasgians. The next step in associating Pelasgians with Argives is the gradual transfer of Homer's Pelasgian Argos in

---

1. Myres, "A History of the Pelasgian Theory," p. 186.

Thessaly to the Peloponnesian Argos. The confusion about what the name Pelasgian Argos described can be seen in two fragments of Hellanikos (T-35). Hellanikos writes in his "Thessalika" that Thessaly was divided into four parts and that one part was called Pelasgiotis. Thus it seems certain that Hellanikos knows that Homer's Pelasgian Argos was in Thessaly. On the other hand, Hellanikos reportedly states in his "History of Argos" that Iasos and Pelasgos, sons of Triopas, divided the realm inherited from their father. Pelasgos received the land on the river Erasinos and founded Larisa. There is also a different report of what Hellanikos says about the division of Argos. Whichever report is closer to what Hellanikos actually writes, both versions clearly refer to Argos in the Peloponnesus and both insist upon the founding of a city called Larisa. In Homer the Pelasgians' home is definitely Larisa. Larisa also seems to have been a prominent city in Thessaly. Therefore, if Pelasgian Argos is to be understood as Peloponnesian Argos, there must also be a Larisa in the Peloponnesus. In the Orestes of Euripides, the identity of Pelasgian and Peloponnesian Argos is simply assumed and is evidently commonly accepted (T-36).

Why did the Greeks almost willfully misunderstand the Homeric terminology and identify Pelasgian Argos with the Argos in the Peloponnesus? Perhaps an explanation can be found in two other traditional views of early Greece. In the first

place, as was discussed in Chapter I, the early times were remembered by the Greeks as Pelasgian times. The term Pelasgian *was almost synonomous for something very old, and the Pelasgian people was the oldest of Greece. Secondly, Argos was remembered to have been the ancient center of Greece (Herodotus i.1.2). Not only did the Danaids arrive there from Egypt, but in Argos was the powerful and rich Mycenae, the "capital" of the heroic age. It might have seemed necessary that Argos should also be the center of the Pelasgian realm, as it was represented in* The Suppliants *of Aeschylus.*

Thus the frequent fifth century association of Pelasgos and his descendents with Argos and Arcadia was long a part of traditional Greek history, even though it represents a clear departure from Homer. Homer does not name any actual Pelasgians in Greece. Hesiod first presents an individual Pelasgos as a genealogical figure and locates him in Arcadia, far from Thessaly and Dodona. The Argives, too, at least as early as Acusilaus, incorporated a Pelasgos into their "national" genealogy. Gradually, Homer's Pelasgian Argos even became located in the Peloponnesus.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

A communis opinio about the early Pelasgians, based primarily on Homer and Hesiod, had been developed by the time of Herodotus. The Homeric Pelasgians, ancient inhabitants of Thessaly and the area around Dodona, became known as the earliest inhabitants of all Greece (Chapter I, pages 7-9). According to Herodotus ii.56, when the oracle at Dodona was established, Hellas was called Pelasgia. This all-inclusive Pelasgia overshadowed the special claims of particular regions, such as Thessaly and Arcadia (Chapter V, pages 45-46), to Pelasgian identity. The realm of King Pelasgos in Aeschylus' Suppliants included all of Greece (T-8). The center of the realm was Argos (Chapter V, page 48).

Fifth century opinion assumed that the Pelasgians were the ancestors of the heroic Greeks, e.g. the ancestors of the Danaans, Arcadians and Athenians. However, the Pelasgians themselves were not prominent in heroic times. One hears of no individual Pelasgian hero from Greece in the ancient tradition. The various Pelasgos figures were important only as representatives of the Pelasgian race, as genealogical figures who secured Pelasgian identity for particular regions and

people. This assumption that the inhabitants of Greece during the heroic age were not known as Pelasgians is based on Homer; he implied only that Pelasgians used to live where Achilles lived in heroic times. In short, the people who fought in the Trojan War were not Pelasgians. The genealogies of Hesiod and Acusilaus traced the ancestors of the heroic peoples back to the Pelasgians; in other words, they extrapolated traditions backwards from Homer (Chapter V, pages 45-46). For example, the Pelasgians were ancient inhabitants of Thessaly in the Iliad. In Asios and Hesiod Pelasgos became the original man (Chapter I, page 8).

Since the Pelasgians were ancestors of the Greek heroes, the fifth century view also assumed a continuity of civilization and population between Pelasgian and heroic times. The Danaids, descendents of Io, were as much Pelasgian as the Argives among whom they asked to be received. Inachus was a Pelasgian ruler and the father of Io. The question never arose in the playwrights whether the Pelasgians represented a different race or culture from the Greek. A people's name could be completely discarded and a new one assumed without any other aspect of its society changing (Chapter I, pages 9-12). Thucydides, after distinguishing clearly between the Hellenic name and Greek nationality, included the Pelasgians among Greeks. Like the dramatists, he assumed a continuity between the Pelasgian and the Hellenic civilizations (Chapter I, pages 12-13).

The contributions of Herodotus to contemporary theories about the Pelasgians were extensive. Perhaps influenced by Hekataios (Chapter I, pages 15-16), Herodotus was the first to raise the question of whether or not the Pelasgians were in fact Greeks. He investigated the Pelasgian language by using the contemporary Pelasgian language as evidence and by comparing it with the contemporary Hellenic. Herodotus concluded from his study that the Pelasgian language was barbarian and, therefore, that the Pelasgians were barbarians (Chapter II). Although Thucydides maintained that all pre-Hellenes, while still Greeks, were barbarian in their language (Chapter II, pages 22-24), Herodotus never clearly distinguished between Hellenes and Greeks; for him, to be Greek was to be Hellenic (Chapter II, pages 20-21). One cannot be certain how sharply Herodotus meant to differentiate Pelasgian and Hellenic whether, like the four Ionian languages, they varied only dialectically, or whether they were two radically different languages (Chapter II, pages 20-21). The historian says only that the Pelasgian language was barbarian.

While concluding from his own research that the Pelasgians were barbarian, Herodotus also fundamentally accepted the fifth century communis opinio, including the assumption that the Pelasgians were the direct ancestors of the later Greeks. Therefore, it was necessary for him to supply some explanation for the transition of a people from barbarism to Hellenism. He found this explanation in the people's language.

The Athenians were indigenous and originally Pelasgian; never was there an important disruption in their history. When, however, the Athenians assumed the Hellenic name and nationality, they also learned the Hellenic language (i.57).

Herodotus also contributed the stories of Pelasgian activity in Attica to the fifth century communis opinio. He is not only the earliest source for the identification of Pelasgians with Athenians (Chapter I, pages 13-14 and Chapter IV, pages 34-37), but he is also the earliest source for the etiological stories about the Pelargian Wall and the ithyphallic Hermes statues (Chapter IV). Possibly Hekataios knew these stories before Herodotus. Whatever the original basis for the accounts, however, Thucydides indicated that at least the tale of the Pelasgians who were expelled from Athens and inhabited Lemnos became a part of accepted Athenian history (T-28b).

The last major contribution of Herodotus to fifth century considerations about the Pelasgians was his belief that the Pelasgians transmitted to the Hellenes certain religious institutions of Egyptian origin (Chapter III). Herodotus heard accounts at Dodona that the oracle there, as well as the names of the gods, had first been used by the Pelasgians. He noticed during his travels in Egypt that the Dodona oracle was similar to Egyptian oracles, and he heard the stories of Egyptian priests claiming that the founder of the oracle in Dodona was an Egyptian. Herodotus also learned

that the Egyptians had always used the name of the individual gods. He concluded that the Greeks must have learned both these things from Egypt. Herodotus also postulated an Egyptian origin for the rite of Demeter and for the Hermes statues introduced to the Athenians by the Pelasgians from Samothrace. The connection of the oracle at Dodona with the Pelasgians was not new; it appeared in Homer and Hesiod. Neither was it a new idea that the Greeks learned some of their religious observances from the Pelasgians. Herodotus' addition to these traditions was his associating them with what he learned in Egypt and his assertion of an ultimate Egyptian origin for certain Hellenic religious institutions: the oracle at Dodona, the names of the gods, the rite of Demeter, and the Herms.

Thus one can discern a communis opinio in the fifth century B.C. concepts of the Pelasgians: They were the earliest Greeks. It is evident in Attic drama, in Herodotus, and to a certain extent in Thucydides. Its basis was Homer and Hesiod. Herodotus accepted this opinion but made three important contributions. He called the Pelasgians barbarians, definitively associated Athenians with the Pelasgians, and claimed that the origins of some Greek religious institutions, which the Hellenes had learned from the Pelasgians, were ultimately Egyptian.

TESTIMONIA

1. Homer, Iliad B, 840-843

Ἱππόθοος δ' ἄγε φῦλα Πελασγῶν ἐγχεσιμώρων
τῶν οἱ Λάρισαν ἐριβώλακα ναιετάασκον·
τῶν ἦρχ' Ἱππόθοός τε Πύλαιός τ', ὄζος Ἄρηος,
υἷε δύω Λήθοιο Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο.

2. Homer, Odyssey T, 172-177

Κρήτη τις γαῖ' ἔστι, μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ,
καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυτος· ἐν δ' ἄνθρωποι
πολλοί, ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόληες —
ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,
ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες,
Δωριέες τε τριχάϊκες δῖοί τε Πελασγοί —

3. Homer, Iliad B, 681-685

Νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὅσσοι τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἔναιον,
οἵ τ' Ἄλον οἵ τ' Ἀλόπην οἵ τε Τρηχῖν' ἐνέμοντο,
οἵ τ' εἶχον Φθίην ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,
Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί,
τῶν αὖ πεντήκοντα νεῶν ἦν ἀρχὸς Ἀχιλλεύς.

4. Homer, Iliad Π, 233-235

Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναῖε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,
Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρου· ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ
σοὶ ναίουσ' ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι.

5. *Homer, Iliad B, 749-750*

τῶν δ' Ἐνιῆνες ἔποντο μενεπτόλεμοί τε Περαιβοί,
οἵ τ' περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί' ἔθεντο,

6. *Hesiod, fragment preserved in Apollodorus 2.i.i*

Ἡσίοδος δὲ τὸν Πελασγὸν αὐτόχθονά φησιν εἶναι.

7. *Asios, fragment preserved in Pausanius viii.1.4*

Ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑψικόμοισιν
ὄρεσσιν
γαῖα μέλαιν' ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν
γένος εἴη.

8. *Aeschylus, The Suppliants, 234-259 (King Pelasgos speaking)*

ποδαπὸν ὄμιλον τόνδ' ἀνελληνόστολον
πέπλοισι βαρβάροισι κἀμπυκώμασι
χλίοντα προσφωνοῦμεν; οὐ γὰρ Ἀργολὶς
ἑοθὼς γυναικῶν οὐδ' ἀφ' Ἑλλάδος τόπων.
ὅπως δὲ χώραν οὔτε κηρύκων ὕπο,
ἀπρόξενοί τε, νόσφιν ἡγητῶν, μολεῖν
ἔτλητ' ἀτρέστως, τοῦτο θαυμαστὸν πέλει.
κλάδοι γε μὲν δὴ κατὰ νόμους ἀφικτόρων
κεῖνται παρ' ὑμῶν πρὸς θεοῖς ἀγωνίοις·
μόνον τόδ' Ἑλλὰς χθὼν συνοίσεται στόχῳ.
καὶ τἄλλα πόλλ' ἐπεικάσαι δίκαιον ἦν,
εἰ μὴ παρόντι φθόγγος ἦν ὁ σημανῶν.

Χο. εἴρηκας ἀμφὶ κόσμον ἀψευδῆ λόγον.
ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς σὲ πότερον ὡς ἔτην λέγω;
ἢ τηρὸν ἱεροῦ ῥάβδον, ἢ πόλεως ἀγόν;
Βα. πρὸς ταῦτ' ἀμείβου καὶ λέγ' εὐθαρσὴς ἐμοί.
τοῦ γηγενοῦς γὰρ εἰμ' ἐγὼ Παλαίχθονος
ἶνις Πελασγός, τῇδε γῆς ἀρχηγέτης.
ἐμοῦ δ' ἄνακτος εὐλόγως ἐπώνυμον
γένος Πελασγῶν τήνδε καρποῦται χθόνα.
καὶ πᾶσαν αἶαν, ἧς δι' ἀγνὸς ἔρχεται
Στρυμών, τὸ πρὸς δύοντος ἡλίου, κρατῶ.

9. Aeschylus, The Suppliants, 289-326

Βα. ... διδαχθεὶς ἂν τόδ' εἰδείην πλέον,
ὅπως γένεθλον σπέρμα τ' Ἀργεῖον τὸ σόν.
Χο. κληδοῦχον Ἥρας φασὶ δωμάτων ποτὲ
Ἰὼ γενέσθαι τῇδ' ἐν Ἀργείᾳ χθονί.
Βα. ἦν ὡς μάλιστα, καὶ φάτις πολλὴ κρατεῖ.
Χο. μὴ καὶ λόγος τις Ζῆνα μειχθῆναι βροτῷ;
Βα. κἀκρυπτά γ' Ἥρας ταῦτα ταμιπαλάγματ' ἦν.
Χο. πῶς οὖν τελευτᾷ βασιλέων νείκη τάδε;
Βα. βοῦν τὴν γυναῖκ' ἔθηκεν Ἀργεία θεός.
Χο. οὐκοῦν πελάζει Ζεὺς ἔτ' εὐκραίρῳ βοΐ;
Βα. φασίν, πρέποντα βουθόρῳ ταύρῳ δέμας.
Χο. τί δῆτα πρὸς ταῦτ' ἄλοχος ἰοχμὰ Διός;
Βα. τὸν πάνθ' ὁρῶντα φύλακ' ἐπέστησεν βοός.
Χο. ποῖον πανόπτην οἰοβουκόλον λέγεις;
Βα. Ἄργον, τὸν Ἑρμῆς παῖδα γῆς κατέκτανεν.

Χο. τί οὖν ἔτευξ' ἔτ' ἄλλο δυσπότμῳ βοΐ;
Βα. βοηλάτην μύωπα κινητήριον.
Χο. οἶστρον καλοῦσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Νείλου πέλας.
Βα. τῇ γάρ νιν ἐκ γῆς ἤλασεν μακρῷ δρόμῳ.
Χο. καὶ ταῦτ' ἔλαξας πάντα συγκόλλως ἐμοί.
Βα. καὶ μὴν Κάνωβον κἀπὶ Μέμφιν ἵκετο.
Χο. καὶ Ζεύς γ' ἐφάπτωρ χειρὶ φιτύει γόνον.
Βα. τίς οὖν ὁ Δῖος πόρτις εὔχεται βοός;
Χο. Ἔπαφος, ἀληθὼς ῥυσίων ἐπώνυμος.
Βα. ⟨Ἐπάφου δὲ τίς ...⟩
Χο. Λιβύη, μέγιστον γῆς ... καρπουμένη.
Βα. τίν' οὖν ἔτ' ἄλλον τῇδε βλαστημὸν λέγεις;
Χο. Βῆλον δίπαιδα, πατέρα τοῦδ' ἐμοῦ πατρός.
Βα. τὸ πάνσοφον νῦν ὄνομα τοὐτου μοι φράσον.
Χο. Δαναός, ἀδελφὸς δ' ἐστὶ πεντηκοντάπαις.
Βα. καὶ τοῦδ' ἄνολγε τοὔνομ' ἀφθόνῳ λόγῳ.
Χο. Αἴγυπτος. εἰδὼς δ' ἀμὸν ἀρχαῖον γένος
πράσσοις ἄν, ὡς Ἀργεῖον ἀντήσας στόλον.
Βα. δοκεῖτε ⟨δή⟩ μοι τῇδε κοινωνεῖν χθονὸς
τἀρχαῖον.

10. Aeschylus, The Suppliants 497-498 (Danaus speaking)

Νεῖλος γὰρ οὐχ ὅμοιον Ἰνάχῳ γένος
τρέφει.

Compare Sophocles, fragment preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus i.25.4

Ἴναχε νᾶτορ, παῖ τοῦ κρηνῶν

πατρὸς Ὠκεανοῦ, μέγα πρεσβεύων
Ἄργους τε γύας Ἥρας τε πάγους
καὶ Τυρσηνοῖσι Πελασγοῖς.

11. *Aeschylus, The Suppliants, 217-220*

Χο. τίν' οὖν κικλήσκω τῶνδε δαιμόνων ἔτι;
Δα. ὁρῶ τρίαιναν τήνδε σημεῖον θεοῦ.
Χο. ἀλλ' εὖ τ' ἔπεμψεν εὖ τε δεξάσθω χθονί.
Δα. Ἑρμῆς ὅδ' ἄλλος τοῖσιν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις.

12. *Euripides, Orestes, 857-858*

ψήφῳ Πελασγῶν σὸν καθίγνητον θανεῖν
καὶ σ', ἔδοξε τῇδ' ἐν ἡμέρᾳ

Compare Euripides Archilaus, fragment preserved in Strabo, v.2.4

Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατὴρ
ἐλθὼν ἐς Ἄργος ᾤκησ' Ἰνάχου πόλιν,
Πελασγιώτας δ' ὠνομασμένους τὸ πρὶν
Δαναοὺς καλεῖσθαι νόμον ἔθηκ' ἀν'
Ἑλλάδα.

13. *Euripides, The Heracleidae, 316*

οὐ γὴν τοσήνδε καὶ Πελασγικὸν λέων

14. *Euripides, Hercules, 464*

τῆς καλλικάρπου κράτος ἔχων Πελασγίας.

15. *Euripides, Phoenissiae, 107-108 and 256*

κινούμενον γὰρ τυχάνει Πελασγικὸν

στράτευμα, ...

Ἄργος ὦ Πελασγικόν

16. *Thucydides, i.3*

Δηλοῖ δέ μοι καὶ τόδε τῶν παλαιῶν ἀσθένειαν οὐχ ἥκιστα· πρὸ γὰρ τῶν Τρωικῶν οὐδὲν φαίνεται πρότερον κοινῇ ἐργασαμένη ἡ Ἑλλάς· δοκεῖ δέ μοι, οὐδὲ τοὔνομα τοῦτο ξύμπασά πω εἶχεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πρὸ Ἕλληνος τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος καὶ πάνυ οὐδὲ εἶναι ἡ ἐπίκλησις αὕτη, κατὰ ἔθνη δὲ ἄλλα τε καὶ τὸ Πελασγικὸν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν παρέχεσθαι, Ἕλληνος δὲ καὶ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Φθιώτιδι ἰσχυσάντων, καὶ ἐπαγομένων αὐτοὺς ἐπ' ὠφελίᾳ ἐς τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, καθ' ἑκάστους μὲν ἤδη τῇ ὁμιλίᾳ μᾶλλον καλεῖσθαι Ἕλληνας, οὐ μέντοι πολλοῦ γε χρόνου [ἐδύνατο] καὶ ἅπασιν ἐκκεκῆσαι. τεκμηριοῖ δὲ μάλιστα Ὅμηρος· πολλῷ γὰρ ὕστερον ἔτι καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν γενόμενος οὐδαμοῦ τοὺς ξύμπαντας ὠνόμασεν, οὐδ' ἄλλους ἢ τοὺς μετ' Ἀχιλλέως ἐκ τῆς Φθιώτιδος, οἵπερ καὶ πρῶτοι Ἕλληνες ἦσαν, Δαναοὺς δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔπεσι καὶ Ἀργείους καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς ἀνακαλεῖ. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἴρηκε

διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἕλληνάς πω, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀντίπαλον ἓς ἓν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι. οἱ δ' οὖν ὡς ἕκαστοι Ἕλληνες κατὰ πόλεις τε ὅσοι ἀλλήλων ξυνίσοαν καὶ ξύμπαντες ὕστερον κληθέντες οὐδὲν πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν δι' ἀσθένειαν καὶ ἀμιξίαν ἀλλήλων ἀθρόοι ἔπραξαν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν στρατείαν θαλάσσῃ ἤδη πλείω χρώμενοι ξυνεξῆλθον.

17. *Thucydides, i.2.5*

τὴν γοῦν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον διὰ τὸ λεπτόγεων ἀοταοίαοτον οὖοαν ἄνθρωποι ᾤκουν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεί.

18. *Thucydides, i.8.1-2*

καὶ οὐχ ἧοοον λῃοταὶ ἦοαν οἱ νῃοιῶται, Κᾶρές τε ὄντες καὶ Φοίνικες· οὗτοι γὰρ δὴ τὰς πλείοτας τῶν νήῳων ᾤκῃοαν. μαρτύριον δέ· Δήλου γὰρ καθαιρομένης ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων ἐν τῷδε τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ τῶν θῃκῶν ἀναιρεθειοῶν ὅοαι ἦοαν τῶν τεθνειώτων ἐν τῇ νήῳῳ, ὑπὲρ ἥμιου Κᾶρες ἐφάνῃοαν, γνωοθέντες τῇ τε οκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων ξυντεθαμμένῃ καὶ τῷ τρόπῳ ᾧ νῦν ἔτι θάπτουοιν. καταοτάντος δὲ τοῦ Μίνω ναυτικοῦ πλωιμώτερα ἐγένετο παρ' ἀλλήλους (οἱ γὰρ ἐκ τῶν νήῳων κακοῦργοι ἀνέοτῃοαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτεπερ καὶ τὰς πολλὰς αὐτῶν κατῴκιζε).

19. *Hekataios from Miletus, fragment preserved in Strabo, vii.7.1*

Ἑκαταῖος μὲν οὖν ὁ Μιλήσιος περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου φησίν, διότι πρὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ᾠκησαν αὐτὴν βάρβαροι.

20. *Thucydides, ii.68.3-5*

Ἄργος τὸ Ἀμφιλοχικὸν καὶ Ἀμφιλοχίαν τὴν ἄλλην ἔκτισε μὲν μετὰ τὰ Τρωικὰ οἰκαδε ἀναχωρήσας καὶ οὐκ ἀρεσκόμενος τῇ ἐν Ἄργει καταστάσει Ἀμφίλοχος ὁ Ἀμφιάρεω ἐν τῷ Ἀμπρακικῷ κόλπῳ, ὀνώνυμον τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδι Ἄργος ὀνομάσας (καὶ ἦν ἡ πόλις αὕτη μεγίστη τῆς Ἀμφιλοχίας καὶ τοὺς δυνατωτάτους εἶχεν οἰκήτορας), ὑπὸ ξυμφορῶν δὲ πολλαῖς γενεαῖς ὕστερον πιεζόμενοι Ἀμπρακιῶται ὁμόρους ὄντας τῇ Ἀμφιλοχικῇ ξυνοίκους ἐπηγάγοντο, καὶ ἠλληνίσθησαν τὴν νῦν γλῶσσαν τότε πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀμπρακιωτῶν ξυνοικησάντων· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι Ἀμφίλοχοι βάρβαροί εἰσιν.

21. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, i.29.2-3*

πολλοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς φωναῖς αὐτῶν διηλλαγμέναις καὶ οὐδεμίαν ὁμοιότητα σωζούσαις τεκμαιρόμενος.

"καὶ γὰρ δὴ οὔτε Κροτωνιῆται" ὡς φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος. "οὐδαμοῖσι τῶν νῦν σφέας περιοικεόντων εἰσὶν ὁμόγλωσσοι οὔτε Πλακιηνοί, σφίσι δ' ὁμόγλωσσοι. δηλοῦσι δὲ ὅτι, τὸν ἠνείκαντο γλώσσης χαρακτῆρα μεταβαίνοντες ἐς ταῦτα τὰ χωρία, τοῦτον ἔχουσιν ἐν φυλακῇ." καίτοι θαυμάσειαν ἄν τις, εἰ Πλακιανοῖς μὲν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον οἰκοῦσιν ὁμοίαν διάλεκτον εἶχον οἱ Κροτωνιᾶται, ἐπειδὴ Πελασγοὶ ἦσαν ἀμφότερο ἀρχῆθεν, Τυρρηνοῖς δὲ τοῖς ἐγγύτατα οἰκοῦσι μηδὲν ὁμοίαν.

22. *Dionysius from Halicarnassus, i.17.2*

ἦν γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὸ τῶν Πελασγῶν γένος Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐχρήσατο δὲ τύχαις δυσπότμοις εἰς πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μάλιστα δ' εἰς τὴν πολύπλανόν τε καὶ οὐδενὸς τόπου βέβαιον οἴκησιν· πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸ καλούμενον νῦν Ἀχαϊκὸν Ἄργος ᾤκησαν αὐτόχθονες ὄντες, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ αὐτῶν λέγουσι.

23. *Dionysius from Halicarnassus, i.20.3*

σύνηθες γὰρ ἦν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Ἕλλησιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ προτιθέναι τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὁπόσων αἱ ἀρχαὶ ἀπὸ φωνηέντων ἐγίγοντο, τὴν "ου"

συλλαβὴν ἑνὶ στοιχείῳ γραφομένην. τοῦτο δ' ἦν ὥσπερ γάμμα διτταῖς ἐπὶ μίαν ὀρθὴν ἐπιζευγνύμενον ταῖς πλαγίοις, ὡς Γελένη καὶ Γάναξ καὶ Γοῖκος καὶ Γέαρ καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα.

24. Diodorus Siculus, iii.67.1 and iii.67.4

φησὶ τοίνυν παρ' Ἕλλησι πρῶτον εὑρετὴν γενέσθαι Λίνον ῥυθμῶν καὶ μέλους, ἔτι δὲ Κάδμου κομίσαντες ἐκ Φοινίκης τὰ καλούμενα γράμματα πρῶτον εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν μεταθεῖναι διάλεκτον, καὶ τὰς προσηγορίας ἑκάστῳ τάξαι καὶ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας διατυπῶσαι. κοινῇ μὲν οὖν τὰ γράμματα Φοινίκεια κληθῆναι διὰ τὸ παρὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐκ Φοινίκων μετενεχθῆναι, ἰδίᾳ δὲ τῶν Πελασγῶν πρώτων χρησαμένων τοῖς μετατεθεῖσι χαρακτῆρσι Πελασγικὰ προσαγορευθῆναι.

τὸν δ' οὖν Λίνον φασὶ τοῖς Πελασγικοῖς γράμμασι συνταξάμενον τὰς τοῦ πρώτου Διονύσου πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἄλλας μυθολογίας ἀπολιπεῖν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν. ὁμοίως δὲ τούτοις χρήσασθαι τοῖς Πελασγικοῖς γράμμασι τὸν Ὀρφέα καὶ προαπίδην τὸν Ὁμήρου διδάσκαλον, εὐθυῆ γεγονότα μελοποιόν.

25. *Hesiod, fragment preserved in Strabo, vii.7.10*

Δωδώνην φηγόν τε, Πελασγῶν ἕδρανον ἧεν.

26. *Homer,* Iliad *E, 693 and H, 60*

εἶσαν ὑπ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς περικαλλέϊ φηγῷ

φηγῷ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο

27. *Ephorus, fragment preserved in Strabo vii.7.10*

ἔστι δ', ὡς φησιν Ἔφορος, Πελασγῶν ἵδρυμα.

28. a) *Thucydides, ii.15.1-2*

ἐπὶ γὰρ Κέκροπος καὶ τῶν πρώτων βασιλέων ἡ Ἀττικὴ ἐς Θησέα αἰεὶ κατὰ πόλεις ᾠκεῖτο πρυτανεῖά τε ἔχούσας καὶ ἄρχοντας, καὶ ὁπότε μή τε δείσειαν, οὐ ξυνῆσαν βουλευόμενοι ὡς τὸν βασιλέα, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἕκαστοι ἐπολίτευον καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο· καί τινες καὶ ἐπολέμησάν ποτε αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐλευσίνιοι μετ' Εὐμόλπου πρὸς Ἐρεχθέα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ Θησεὺς ἐβασίλευσε, γενόμενος μετὰ τοῦ ξυνετοῦ καὶ δυνατὸς τά τε ἄλλα διεκόσμησε τὴν χώραν καὶ καταλύσας τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων τά τε βουλευτήρια καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐς τὴν νῦν πόλιν οὖσαν, ἓν βουλευτήριον ἀποδείξας καὶ πρυτανεῖον, ξυνῴκισε πάντας,

καὶ νεμομένους τὰ αὐτῶν ἑκάστους ἅπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἠνάγκασε μιᾷ πόλει ταύτῃ χρῆσθαι, ἡ ἁπάντων ἤδη ξυντελούντων ἐς αὐτὴν μεγάλη γενομένη παρεδόθη ὑπὸ Θησέως τοῖς ἔπεσι.

b) Thucydides, iv.109.4

αἱ οἰκοῦνται ξυμμείκτοις ἔθνεσι βαρβάρων δυγλώσσων, καί τι καὶ Χαλκιδικὸν ἓν βραχύ, τὸ δὲ πλεῖστον Πελασγικόν, τῶν καὶ Λῆμνόν ποτε καὶ Ἀθήνας Τυρσηνῶν οἰκησάντων καὶ Βισαλτικὸν καὶ Κρηστωνικὸν καὶ Ἠδῶνες.

29. a) Strabo, v.2.4

καὶ οἱ τὴν Ἀτθίδα συγγράψαντες ἱστοροῦσι περὶ τῶν Πελασγῶν ὡς καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι γενομένων τῶν Πελασγῶν διὰ δὲ τὸ πλανήτας εἶναι καὶ δίκην ὀρνέων ἐπιφοιτᾶν ἐφ' οὓς ἔτυχε τόπους Πελαργοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀττικῶν κληθῆναι.

b) Strabo, ix.2.3

προσθέντες δὲ τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ τὴν Ὀρχομενίαν (οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κοινῇ πρότερον, οὐδ' Ὅμηρος μετὰ Βοιωτῶν αὐτοὺς κατέλεξεν, ἀλλ' ἰδίᾳ, Μινύας προσαγορεύσας) μετ' ἐκείνων ἐξέβαλον τοὺς μὲν Πελασγοὺς εἰς Ἀθήνας, ἀφ' ὧν ἐκλήθη μέρος τι τῆς πόλεως Πελασγικόν, ᾤκησαν δὲ ὑπὸ τῷ Ὑμηττῷ, τοὺς δὲ Θρᾷκας ἐπὶ τὸν Παρνασσόν.

30. *Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis, 1498-1499*

ἰὼ γᾶ μᾶτερ ὦ Πελασγία,
Μυκηναῖαί τ' ἐμαὶ Θεράπναι

31. *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound, 860-861*

Πελασγία δὲ δέξεται θηλυκτόνῳ
Ἄρει δαμέντων νυκτιφρουρήτῳ θράσει.

32. *Ephorus, fragment preserved in Strabo, v.2.4*

νομίζειν δέ φησιν Ἔφορος τὸ ἀνέκαθεν
Ἀρκάδας ὄντας ἐλέσθαι στρατιωτικὸν
βίον, εἰς δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγωγὴν
προτρέποντες πολλοὺς ἅπασι τοῦ
ὀνόματος μεταδοῦναι καὶ πολλὴν
ἐπιφάνειαν κτήσασθαι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς
Ἕλλησι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις, παρ'
οὓς ποτὲ ἀφιγμένοι τετυχήκασι.

33. *Hesiod, fragment preserved in Strabo, v.2.4*

τῷ δ' Ἐφόρῳ τοῦ ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας εἶναι
τὸ φῦλον τοῦτο ἦρξεν Ἡσίοδος. φησὶ γάρ:
υἱεῖς ἐξεγένοντο Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοιο,
ὅν ποτε τίκτε Πελασγός.

34. *Acusilaus, fragment preserved in Apollodorus, ii.1.1 (The Library)*

Νιόβης δὲ καὶ Διός (ἧ πρώτῃ γυναικὶ
Ζεὺς θνητῇ ἐμίγη) παῖς Ἄργος ἐγένετο,

ὡς δὲ Ἀκουσιλαός φησι, καὶ Πελασγός, ἀφ' οὗ κληθῆναι τοὺς τὴν Πελοπόννησον οἰκοῦντας Πελασγούς.

35. *Hellanikos of Lesbos*

a) *F. Gr. Hist.*, F 52, *Harpocr. Suid. s.*

τετραρχία ... τεττάρων μερῶν ὄντων τῆς Θετταλίας ἕκαστον μέρος τετρὰς ἐκαλεῖτο, καθά φησιν Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Θετταλικοῖς. ὀνόμα(τα) δέ φησιν εἶναι ταῖς τετράσι Θετταλιῶτιν Φθιῶτιν Πελασγιῶτιν Ἑστιαιῶτιν.

b) *F. Gr. Hist.*, F 36b; *Scholia A to Homer*, Iliad Γ. 75

Ἴασος καὶ Πελασγὸς Τριόπα παῖδες. τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς διείλοντο τὴν βασιλείαν. λαχὼν δὲ Πελασγὸς μὲν τὰ πρὸς Ἐρασῖνον ποταμὸν ἔκτισε Λάρισαν, Ἴασος δὲ τὰ πρὸς Ἥλιν. τελευτησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ νεώτατος ἀδελφὸς Ἀγήνωρ ἐπεστράτευσε τῇ χώρᾳ, πολλὴν ἵππον ἐπαγόμενος, ὅθεν ἐκλήθη ἱππόβοτον μὲν τὸ Ἄργος ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀγήνορος ἵππου, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἰάσου Ἴασον. ἱστορεῖ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν Ἀργολικοῖς.

c) *F. Gr. Hist.*, F 36; *Scholia Eustathius to Homer, Iliad* Γ. 75

φησὶ δὲ Ἑλλάνικος, παῖδας τρεῖς
Φορωνέως γενέσθαι, οἱ, τοῦ πατρὸς
θανόντος διενείμαντο τὴν Ἀργείαν. καὶ
ὁ μὲν πρὸς Ἐρασίνῳ τῷ ποταμῷ
Πελασγῷ ἔλαχε τῷ καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ Λάρισαν
κτίσαντι.

36. *Euripides, Orestes*, 1601

ἐν Ἄργει τῷδε τῷ Πελασγικῷ

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bengtson, H. Griechische Geschichte. Vol. III.4: Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Munich: C. H. Beck' sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1950.

Diodorus. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Georgiev, Vladimir. "Die Herkunft der Namen der grössten Flüsse der Balkanhalbinsel und ihre Bedeutung zur Ethnogenese der Balkanvölker," Balkansko Ezikozmanie, I, 1959, pp. 5-16.

Gomme, A. W. A Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Groten, F. J. Jr. "Herodotus' Use of Variant Versions," Phoenix, XVII, 2, 1963, pp. 79-87.

Harmatta, Janos. "Das Pelasgische und die alten Balkansprachen," Balkansko Ezikozmanie, IX, 1, 1964, pp. 41-47.

Harrison, Jane Ellen. Primitive Athens, as Described by Thucydides. Cambridge: University Press, 1906.

Herodotus. The Histories. Introduction and notes by Reginald Walter Macan. London: Macmillan & Co., 1895.

Herodotus. The Histories. Introduction and notes by Heinrich Stein. 5th ed. Berlin: Weidemannsche Buchhandlung, 1883.

How, W. W. and Wells, J. A Commentary on Herodotus. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Kahlo, G. "Die Pelasger," Ziva Antika, XI, 1962, pp. 245-249.

Kretschmer, Paul. "Die Protoindogermanische Schicht," Glotta, XIV, 1925, pp. 300-319.

_____. "Die vorgriechischen Sprach- und Volksschichten," Glotta, XXVIII, 1940, pp. 231-278.

_____. "Die vorgriechischen Sprach- und Volksschichten," Glotta, XXX, 1943, pp. 84-128.

Linforth, Ivan M. "Greek Gods and Foreign Gods in Herodotus," University of California Publications in Classical Philology, IX, 1926, pp. 1-25.

Lochner-Hüttenbach, Fritz. Die Pelasger. Vol. 6: Arbeiten aus dem Institut für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft. Vienna: Gerold & Co., 1960.

Meyer, Eduard. Forschungen zur alten Geschichte. Vol. I, Halle a S: Max Niemeyer, 1892.

Munro, J. A. R. "Pelasgians and Ionians," JHS, LIV, 1934, pp. 109-128.

Myres, John L. "A History of the Pelasgian Theory," JHS, XXVII, 1907, pp. 170-225.

Powell, J. Enoch. A Lexicon to Herodotus. 2nd ed. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.

Prakken, Donald Wilson. Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology. Lancaster, Pa: Lancaster Press, Inc., 1943.

Schachemeyr, Fritz. "Pelasgoi," Realenzyklopädie der classichen Altertumswissenschaft, XIX, 1, 1937, pp. 252-256.

Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War. Introduction and notes by Thomas Arnold. 6th ed. Oxford: John Henry & James Parker, 1863.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. Der Glaube der Hellenen. Vol. I, Berlin: Weidemannsche Buchhandlung, 1931.

Windekens, Albert J. van. Études Pelasgiques. Vol. XLIX: Bibliotèque du Muséon. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1960.

_____. "The Name of the Pelasgians," Names, VI, 1958, pp. 184-186.

_____. "Pelasgisch und Westindogermanisch. Neues Material," Sprache, IV, 1958, pp. 128-138.